

Serial No.: 10/575,338
Filed: April 10, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the above application in view of the above amendments and the below remarks is requested.

Claim 6 has been amended.

The Examiner has rejected claims 6 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sander et al (US 4,247,611) in view of Pai et al (US 5,648,194). Claims 6 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sander et al (US 4,247,611) in view of Pai et al (US 5,648,194) and further in view of Hatanaka et al (WO 03/087941).

The applicants have amended claim 6 to include and further define the element (C). Support is present in the specification on page 12. The photosensitizing agent is not a chloride but a reaction product of a halide and a compound with a functional group, and as such the halide is removed during the reaction and is not present in the component (C).

The prior art of Sander et al discloses in column 9, lines 5-46, only the use of diazonium salts, specifically o-naphthaquinone diazide, more specifically naphthaquinone-1,2-diazide-4-sulfochloride. Sander does not disclose a compound which is the reaction product of halide quinonediazidesulfonate and a compound capable of reacting with the acid chloride to form the present compound (C). The presently claimed compound (C) is not a chloride or halide. In fact, Sander et al even teaches that quinone diazides are not acceptable, as shown in column 1, line 14-17 and column 10, lines 55-58:

Serial No.: 10/575,338
Filed: April 10, 2006

“...positive-working copying compositions based on o-quinone diazides have gained acceptance in practice. Frequently, the light-sensitivity of these copying materials is not satisfactory....”

“...As compared with other known positive-working layers, especially those containing o-naphthoquinone diazides, greater advantages are achieved in the production of relatively thick layers..”

Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Sander et al to use the presently claimed compound (C) which is not a salt, since Sander teaches only the diazonium salts, specifically chloride, to be used as the radiation sensitive component, and moreover teaches against the use of quinone diazide salts. Thus Sander teaches neither the present compound (C) nor the compound (F). Further Sander does not teach the specific mixture of the quinonediazide compound and the acid generating agent. Thus there is no reason one of ordinary skill in the art would look to Pai et al as a useful reference since as the Examiner has noted, Pai et al references the acid halide. There is no teaching singly or in combination which teaches the specific combination of components of the present combination.

In light of the presented arguments the Examiner is requested to remove the prior art of Sander et al and Pai et al.

Serial No.: 10/575,338
Filed: April 10, 2006

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and reconsideration of it is requested. If the Examiner disagrees, she is requested to contact the attorney for Applicants at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Sangya Jain
Reg. No. 38,504
AZ Electronic Materials USA Corp.
70 Meister Avenue
Somerville, NJ 08876
Telephone: (908) 429-3536
Facsimile: (908) 429-3650

Customer No. 26,289